UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/751,390	01/05/2004	Johannes Kaeppeler	03345-P0046A	2672

24126 7590 02/13/2008

ST. ONGE STEWARD JOHNSTON & REENS, LLC
986 BEDFORD STREET
STAMFORD, CT 06905-5619

EXAMINER	
MACARTHUR, SYLVIA	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1792	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/13/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10751390	1/5/04	KAEPPELER, JOHANNES	03345-P0046A

ST. ONGE STEWARD JOHNSTON & REENS, LLC
986 BEDFORD STREET
STAMFORD, CT 06905-5619

EXAMINER
Sylvia R. MacArthur

ART UNIT	PAPER
1792	20080211

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

This communication is sent to clarify the reference by Standnes cited in the Examiner Answer mailed 1/22/2008. The Standnes reference ("TheElectrical Conductivity of the Elements Table") was cited in the PTO-892 as Non-Patent Literature (NPL) citation (V) mailed 6/5/2007 and was used as evidence of the electrical conductivities of the cited metals (known property of each metal) in the Final Rejection mailed 6/5/2007. The reference was restated for purposes of clarity, but was not to be construed as a "new citation of prior art" nor was the rejection of 9(A) of the Examiner's Answer to be viewed as new as the body of the rejection was the same. See paragraph 4 of the Final Rejection mailed 6/5/2007 and compare the Rejection 9(A) of the Answer.In essence, as evidenced by "The Electrical Conductivity of the Elements Table" to Standness statement does not constitute a new grounds of rejection as it is placed in the grounds of rejection statement of 9(A) purely for consistency for the Board.

/Sylvia R MacArthur/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792